

February __, 1991

AIR MAIL

Mr. John H. Bass
Reddie & Grose
16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL
ENGLAND

Re: Australian Pat. Appln. No. 38816/89
Your File: 30591
Our File: PM-1322 (Australia)

Dear John:

Thank you for your February 6, 1991 letter enclosing the official action in this case.

With respect to Paragraph 2 of the action, we prefer to alter the application as little as possible. Thus, it seems preferable to correct the objects to statements of advantage, rather than deleting them.

With respect to Paragraphs 3(a & b), what you call the "essential features," which we have discussed previously in connection with actions in other countries are, radiative and convective heat transfer, and the differential permeability. We agree with your analysis of the Examiner's problem, but wonder what the solution might be. Is it permissible under Australian practice to amend the specification to recite that the various features are, as you put it, "matters of preference"? If so, that would seem to be the best response. Otherwise, we will have to simply argue the matter.

With respect to Paragraph 4, we agree with Callinan's suggestions (a) and (b). As to (c), perhaps the Examiner is thinking of the colloquial definition of "fluid", which is "liquid", although that seems unlikely.

2020048778

Mr. John H. Bass:

February __, 1991

2

We can offer no other explanation and it appears the point will have to be argued to the Examiner.

With respect to the alternate claims, it appears that Callinan's is thinking in terms of amending the present claims, where appropriate, and, as you point out, most of the amendments will be in the specification in any event. Thus, we see no reason to make wholesale changes in the claims.

Please let me know if you need anything further.

Very truly yours,

JHI:bas

Jeffrey H. Ingerman

cc: Ms. Beverly A. Monroe

2020048779